DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 931 HE 012 854

AUTHOR Capoor, Madan
TITLE Use of the Community College Goals Inventory in Assessing Institutional Success in Allocating Appropriate Priorities to Its Goals and to Estimate the Change of Priorities Needed to Achieve Its Intended Outcomes. AIR Forum 1980 Paper.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 15p.: Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (20th, Atlanta, GA, April 27-May 1, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability: College Planning: *Community Colleges: Decision Making: Educational Assessment: *Educational Objectives: Higher Education: Institutional Research: Long Range Planning: Needs Assessment: Organizational Effectiveness: *Organizational Objectives: *Questionnaires: *Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum 1980: *Community College Goals Inventory

ABSTRACT

The use of the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI) to assess priorities assigned to institutional goals and to estimate priority changes required to reach intended outcomes was studied. The CCGI consists of goal statements that mainly cover outcome and process goal areas. Respondents indicate their perceptions of how much importance is currently given by the institution to a particular goal and how much importance it should be given, using a five-point scale. Responses were obtained from the Board of Trustees, academic and nonacademic administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and community representatives. Since every constituent group desired that a higher priority be given to each of the goal areas, the goal areas were ranked on the basis of the size of the perceived and desired importance means, and the size of the difference between the two means. An additional adjustment of the procedure permitted identification of goal areas that should receive reduced emphasis, and allowed roughly estimating the extent of the negative or positive change in the emphasis on different goal areas. It is concluded that the findings are more useful in setting long-term and broad-based priorities than in making routine decisions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189931

USE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY IN ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL SUCCESS IN ALLOCATING APPROPRIATE PRIORITIES TO ITS GOALS AND TO ESTIMATE THE CHANGE OF PRIORITIES NEEDED TO ACHIEVE ITS INTENDED OUTCOMES

Dr. Maden Capoor
Director of Institutional Research

Middlesex County College
Edison, New Jersey 08817

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A+K

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 012 854

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Twentieth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Peachtree Plaza Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia, April 27 - May 1, 1980. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

USE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY IN ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL SUCCESS IN ALLOCATING APPROPRIATE PRIORITIES TO ITS GOALS AND TO ESTIMATE THE CHANGE OF PRIORITIES NEEDED TO ACHIEVE ITS INTENDED OUTCOMES

Dr. Madan Capoor
Director of Institutional Research

Middlesex County College
Edison, New Jersey 08817

INTRODUCTION

If the goals of an institution are seen as its intended outcomes, the identification and definition of institutional goals become the necessary first steps in a planning cycle or in setting up an accountability system based on outcome measurement.

The Institutional Goals Inventory and recently the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI) have been made available by the Educational Testing Service to help the post-secondary institutions in establishing, clarifying or reformulating their institutional goals. However, once an institution achieves the consensus on its desired goals, it must undertake two further tasks to move along in its planning and assessment process.

1. Build bridges between the institutional goals and program objectives to guide its programs, and to identify outcomes and the means of their measure-

ment in order to establish a system of institutional assessment based on outcome measurements. The National Center for Higher Education Management System's study on "Measure of Institutional Goal Achievement," Romney (1978) offers an excellent example of the latter process.

2. Before outcomes can be achieved and measured, an institution must allocate its resources to its programs based on some priorities. Unless these priorities are based on the outcomes of an established planning process, historical accretions and antecedents, and personal and group power pressures are likely to be the determinants of these priorities. In order to make sure that the institutional outcomes are in accordance with the desired goals, the discrepancies between the current and the desired institutional priorities must be identified so that the priorities and the resources could be re-allocated to steer the institution in the desired direction.

Purpose of the Paper

This paper offers an example of how the CCGI can be used not only to review the current and the desired priorities, but to identify institutional goal areas in which the institution has been successful in allocating appropriate priorites and the goal areas in which re-allocation of priorities is indicated, and in the case of the latter to make some estimate of the direction and the extent of the re-allocations.

Description of the Instrument

The CCGI consists of 90 goal statements, 80 of which cover 10 outcome and 10 process goal areas, and the remaining 10 goals are treated as the miscellaneous goals. On a five point scale, representing the degree of importance, the respondents are asked to indicate, on the basis of their perceptions, as to how much importance is currently given by the institution to a particular goal, and, in their judgment, how much importance it should be given.

Data Collection

Through mail and through classroom administration in the case of students, responses on the CCGI were obtained from the Board of Trustees, academic and nonacademic administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and community representatives.

Data Analysis

As part of the scoring service, the Educational Testing Service supplied the 'Is' and 'Should Be' means and standard deviations for various subgroups of respondents on each of the goal statements, as well as on the twenty outcome and process goal areas. 'Is' means represent the current emphasis, and 'Should Be' means the desired emphasis on the institutional goals. In the interest of economy and simplicity, the discussion in this paper will be confined to the twenty goal areas without any reference to the individual goals.

Assuming that the perceptions by the different constituent groups of the current institutional priorities are likely to be based on their perceptions of the allocation

of the resources and the extent of operations in a particular goal area, the size of the discrepancy between the perceived and the desired importance, i.e., between the 'Is' and 'Should Be' means, can be seen as an indication of the gap between what the institution is doing and what it ought to be doing, according to a particular constituent group. However, partly as an artifact of the design of the CCGI in which the 'Should Be' rating follow immediately 'Is' rating for every goal, and partly because of the common human aspiration that reach should exceed the grasp, it was found that every constituent group desired a higher priority to be given to each of the goal areas than the priority being given to it. Increasing the emphasis on any goal area implies allocating more resources to it, but given a finite amount of resources, this would be an impossible task to achieve. Hence, in order to derive more meaningful information from the data, the twenty goal areas were ranked on the basis of the size of 'Is' and 'Should Be' means, and the size of the difference between the two means. This yielded three

rankings: ranking by current importance, ranking by desired importance, and ranking by the change of importance indicated.

While these rankings were helpful in identifying goal areas in which relatively more or less change of emphasis was needed, these rankings still did not provide the information on areas on which the emphasis could be reduced, and the relative size of the increase and decrease of emphasis needed. To achieve this, a procedure was developed which is described here.

In order to reduce the spurious gap between 'Is' and 'Should Be' ratings, and to bring the reach within the grasp, the discrepancy between the two means was adjusted downward by deducting from it the mean discrepancy for all outcome and process goal areas respectively.[1]

---

[1]The procedure described above was applied separately to the outcome and process goal areas to retain the necessary distinctions between the two areas so that valid conclusions could be drawn.

This resulted in an adjusted discrepancy having both negative and positive values. The ratio between the adjusted discrepancy and the 'Is' mean was computed as a percentage to indicate the direction and the size of the change in emphasis indicated in a particular goal area.

The procedure described above helped in achieving two major objectives.

1. It was now possible to identify not only the areas in which an increase of emphasis was indicated, but, as a balancing factor, areas for reduced emphasis were also identified.

2. It allowed making a rough estimate of the extent of the negative or positive change in the emphasis on different goal areas.

Findings

Using the data for the academic administrators, an illustration of the procedure described above is presented in this section. The data and the findings are reported on the outcome goal areas in Table 1 and on the process goal areas in Table 2.

As can be seen in Table 1, change in emphasis is desired in six of the ten outcome areas, but the indication for the increase in emphasis in three areas is balanced out by the decrease in emphasis indicated in three other areas. In the process goal areas, increased emphasis is indicated for four areas, and decrease in emphasis for three areas. In four of the outcome goal areas and three of the process goal areas, the change in emphasis indicated was less than 5 percent which was judged insignificant in view of the nature of the data, and the possible use of the findings to indicate roughly the extent of the change in emphasis needed.

Table 1
Computation of Change in Emphasis for Outcome Goal Areas

	'Is' Mean	'Should' Be Mean	Discrepancy[1]	Adjusted Discrepancy[2]	Change in Emphasis[3] %
1.General Education	3.69	4.26	0.57	-.53	-14
2.Intellectual Orientation	3.03	4.17	1.14	.04	0[4]
3.Lifelong Learning	3.20	4.29	1.09	-.01	0
4.Cultural/ Aesthetic Awareness	2.12	3.24	1.12	.02	0
5.Personal Development	2.54	3.99	1.46	.35	14
6.Humanism/ Altruism	2.21	3.78	1.57	.47	21
7.Vocational/ Technical Preparation	3.61	4.39	0.78	-.32	- 9
8.Developmental/ Remedial Prep.	2.87	4.25	1.38	.28	10
9.Community Services	2.57	3.62	1.05	-.05	0
10.Social Criticism	2.18	3.03	0.85	-.25	-11

[1]Discrepancy = 'Should Be' Mean - 'Is' Mean

[2]Adjusted Discrepancy = Discrepancy - Mean Discrepancy

[3]Change in Emphasis = (Adjusted Discrepancy/'Is' Mean) 100

[4]Any change within 5% was considered insignificant

Table 2
Computation of Change in Emphasis for Process Goal Areas

	'Is' Mean	'Should' Be Mean	Discrepancy	Adjusted Discrepancy	Change in Emphasis %
1.Counseling/ Advising	3.35	4.21	0.86	-.15	0
2.Student Services	2.94	3.84	0.90	-.11	0
3.Faculty/Staff Development	2.82	4.13	1.31	.30	11
4.Intellectual Environment	2.64	3.80	1.16	.15	6
5.Innovation	2.29	3.78	1.49	.48	21
6.College Community	2.55	4.18	1.63	.62	24
7.Freedom	3.22	3.61	0.39	-.62	-19
8.Accessibility	3.57	4.18	0.61	-.40	-11
9.Effective Management	3.08	4.13	1.05	.04	0
10.Accountability	3.16	3.92	0.75	-.25	- 8

Conclusion

The lack of change in emphasis needed in a goal area may be indicative of an institution's success in giving to that goal area the right amount of emphasis. Similarly, the change indicated in a goal area may indicate an institution's failure to give it the right amount of emphasis, but it is doubtful that the percent of change in emphasis indicated in a goal can be directly translated in the re-allocation of the resources. There are two major problems with it.

1. The change indicated is based on the responses of one constituent group. Using a participatory and judgmental process, such indications from different constituent groups must be reconciled to arrive at an acceptable set of change indicators.

2. In allocating the resources, several other constraints and considerations have to be kept in mind then merely the desires of the constituent groups.

In any case, the findings such as these are more useful in setting long-term and broad-based institutional priorities rather than in making routine decisions; more useful in the planning process than in conducting operations.

Bibliography

Romney, Leonard Measures of Institutional Goal Achievement, Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. (1978)

fg 9464A